



Universitat de Lleida

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10459.1/69597>

The final publication is available at:

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32609-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32609-6)

Copyright

cc-by-nc-nd, (c) Elsevier, 2019



Està subjecte a una llicència de [Reconeixement-NoComercial-SenseObraDerivada 4.0 de Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

More talk than action? Gender and ethnic diversity in leading public health universities

Summary

Improving the career progression of women and ethnic minorities in public health universities has been a longstanding challenge, which we believe may be addressed by including staff diversity data in university rankings. We present findings from a mixed methods investigation of gender and ethnicity-related differences in career progression at the 15 highest ranked public health universities in the world, including an analysis of the intersection between sex and ethnicity. Our study revealed that clear gender and ethnic disparities remain at the most senior academic positions, despite numerous diversity policies and actions plans reported. In all universities, there was a decline in representation of women between mid and senior academic levels, despite women outnumbering men at the junior level. Ethnic minority women may experience a magnified disadvantage as ethnic minority academics constitute a small proportion of junior level positions and the proportion of ethnic minority women declines along the seniority pathway.

Gender and ethnic diversity in the highest-ranking public health universities

'Has it occurred to you that nothing is ever done until everyone is convinced that it ought to be done, and has been convinced for so long that it is now time to do something else? And are you not aware that conviction has never yet been produced by an appeal to reason, which only makes people uncomfortable? If you want to move them, you must address your arguments to prejudice and the political motive' – Being a Guide for the Young Academic Politician, 1908.¹

Action on gender disparities in the workplace has been unacceptably slow, despite mounting evidence of the discrimination and disadvantage faced by women in many occupational sectors around the world.²⁻⁴ However, recent efforts to document and expose gender inequalities - such as the UK's initiative on 'gender pay gap' reporting by organisations with more than 250 employees - have been instrumental in generating debate and political attention to the topic of gender discrimination in the workplace.^{5,6} By highlighting explicit or implicit disparities in human resource management, the tracking and public reporting of critical indicators puts organisations' reputations at stake. This in turn creates a 'political motive' for them to act.¹ In our study, we apply this strategy to a set of institutions that we believe are lagging instead of leading on achieving gender equity: universities focusing on public health.

We focus on underrepresentation of women in senior roles and sex differences in progression up the career ladder, which is a well-documented but poorly addressed challenge in both global health and academia.⁷⁻⁹ For example, figures from the European Union indicate that only 21% of full professors are women, and even fewer are heads of universities.⁷ Data on women's progression from junior to senior academic positions in health-related fields from the US show a similar situation.^{10,11} Qualitative studies in diverse settings have indicated that even if the number of women in senior positions increases, the power of an authoritative position is often downplayed when that position is held by a woman, and that the academic career path is structured in line with male perceptions of success.¹²⁻¹⁴

Deviations from meritocratic career progression in academia are not only related to gender (which we define as traits or experiences that are culturally based as opposed to biological sex differences).¹⁵ There is evidence to suggest that barriers related to ethnicity may be even greater than for gender, and that gender intersects with ethnicity to create an increased vulnerability to bias among ethnic minority women.^{16,17} A study on minority researchers - defined as women or people of colour - found that 72% encountered workplace barriers relating to ethnicity and 26% reported barriers related to gender.¹⁸ Despite efforts over the past 30 years, only modest improvements in faculty ethnic diversity in health or science-related fields have been achieved, and research focusing on leading academic institutions on this topic is extremely limited, particularly outside of the US.^{19,20}

Furthermore, there is some evidence to suggest that disparities may be worse in the highest ranking academic institutions, which should in fact be setting an example for other institutions that may model their development on the leaders in the field.²³ We therefore conducted a mixed methods investigation of career progression at 15 leading public health academic institutions, encompassing a sex-disaggregated analysis of how sex and ethnicity intersect and a content analysis of policy documents.

As we detail in our paper, all 15 universities have ethnicity and diversity policies and strategies, and the vast majority have leadership and mentorship schemes, despite differences in performance on gender and ethnic

diversity. However, in spite of these efforts, substantial gender and ethnic disparities remain and there is limited reporting on the existence of monitoring and evaluation activities to track and measure outcomes. Thus, universities may be saying more than they are doing.

In light of the potential influence of university rankings on generating healthy competition and influencing institutions' reputations,^{49,50} we believe that tracking and publicly reporting sex and ethnicity statistics along the career pathway will catalyse action to improve diversity. Rankings are recognised as a powerful tool that can '...subtly, powerfully, and enduringly shape perceptions of ability and achievement'.⁵⁵ We therefore call for university ranking systems, such as the US News and Times Higher Education, to take into account academic staff diversity scores. We further urge universities to make information on gender and ethnic diversity at different seniority levels publicly available. The US News ranking system has since 2001 published a 'diversity index' that ranks schools based on measures of the proportion of ethnic minority (EM) students but there is no faculty diversity index included in the overall ranking.⁵⁵ Reporting of information on faculty diversity for individual universities may inform decisions of prospective staff, students and funding bodies.

Methods

After reviewing several university ranking schemes,^{36,38,39} we used the US News 2018 ranking table to identify the top 15 global universities for public health, all of which were based in the UK, USA or Canada.³⁷

Complete names and professional grades of staff in each department within the school of public health (or equivalent) were manually extracted from university websites between 9-16 February 2018. Data on 13,619 unique staff were recorded in a standardised database. Three researchers independently classified the grade and job descriptors for each individual into categories, as summarised in appendix 1, based on protocols used in existing literature.⁴⁰⁻⁴⁵ A study database containing only junior, mid-level and senior academic staff was created (n=8801) for analysis. Since only publicly available data were used for our analysis, ethical approval was not required.

Two validated software tools, Gender-epi and Onolytics, designed to assign sex and ethnicity to individuals based on their names, were used to generate classifications for each academic staff member in our study database (details in appendix 2). In order to investigate intersectionality between sex and ethnicity, we classified individuals into one of four groups: NEM men, EM men, NEM women and EM women. We then analysed proportions of each of these four groups at junior, mid and senior academic positions.

In parallel, a content analysis of equality policies on gender and ethnicity was conducted for the 15 universities. Using a standardised proforma, we extracted information on equality policies, strategic plans and actions for the coming years, specific activities targeted towards addressing gender and ethnic equality, existent mentoring and leadership programmes, and groups and networks involved in fostering equality. Data were extracted by one researcher, and verified against the source document by a second researcher. Thematic analysis was used to inductively identify themes from the data. Coding was conducted using NVivo 10 software and leveraging on techniques from grounded theory.^{46,47}

We sent all 15 universities a summary of quantitative data on academic staff and a list of policies identified for verification. Nine universities (60%) responded, of which eight confirmed that our numbers were within 5% of their faculty size, and one identified an additional department that they include within public health which we subsequently included in our analysis. One University highlighted specific policies or programmes that we had missed.

Magnified disadvantage of ethnic minority women in reaching senior academic positions

Overall, the proportion of men and women across academic positions in the 15 highest-ranking public health universities was mostly equal and approximately one third of academic faculty were from EM groups (table 1). However, analysing the sex and ethnic composition of academic staff by junior, mid-level and senior positions surfaced clear disparities in the four groups we tracked. Considering barriers that operate at two stages – securing a junior post-doctoral position and being promoted to the senior-most level – we found that NEM women represent the highest proportion of junior staff (37%), but the proportion declines from mid- to senior levels in the majority of universities analysed. Similarly, the proportion of EM women declines from mid- to senior levels. However, as illustrated by figure 1, EM women comprise a smaller proportion of the total cohort at the junior level (19%) and, coupled with the downward trajectory moving along the seniority pathway, this results in less than 9% of senior positions being held by EM women. NEM men comprise 25% of the faculty at the junior level but show a sharp increase as we move along the seniority pathway, particularly between mid- and senior levels, surpassing the proportion of NEM women at the mid-to-senior level junction. EM men, similar to EM women, are poorly represented at the junior level but unlike EM women do not show a sharp decline across the seniority levels.

These results therefore indicate that gender and ethnicity related barriers to securing senior academic positions may operate differently, while also intersecting; ethnic disparities appeared across seniority levels whilst gender disparities were more evident between the mid and senior levels. Our findings of gender and ethnic disparities at senior levels are consistent with quantitative analyses conducted in British, European and South Asian universities.^{23 51 52 53} Literature on this topic relates heightened marginalisation experienced by EM women to cultural factors, institutional structures and individuals' personality traits (such as assertiveness)¹⁸.

Table 1: Sex and ethnicity distribution within the 15 leading universities focusing on public health [NEM = non-ethnic minority; EM = ethnic minority]

| Rank | University | Faculty size n(%) | EM Women n(%) | NEM Women n(%) | EM Men n(%) | NEM Men n(%) | Unclassified n(%) |
|------|--|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 1 | Harvard (HU) | 644 (7) | 85 (13) | 149 (23) | 165 (26) | 235 (37) | 11 (2) |
| 2 | Johns Hopkins (JHU) | 1033 (12) | 134 (13) | 310 (30) | 199 (19) | 367 (36) | 24 (2) |
| 3 | Stanford (SU) | 425 (5) | 72 (17) | 98 (23) | 82 (19) | 166 (39) | 7 (2) |
| 4 | University of Oxford (OU) | 875 (10) | 100 (11) | 233 (27) | 152 (17) | 363 (42) | 28 (3) |
| 5 | University College London (UCL) | 621 (7) | 93 (15) | 222(36) | 92 (15) | 202 (33) | 12 (2) |
| 6 | London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) | 513 (6) | 75 (15) | 198 (39) | 69 (14) | 165 (32) | 6 (1) |
| 7 | University of Michigan (UM-AA) | 347 (4) | 38 (11) | 100 (29) | 74 (21) | 128 (37) | 7 (2) |
| 8 | University of Washington (UW) | 1069 (12) | 119 (11) | 353 (33) | 182 (17) | 399 (37) | 18 (2) |
| 9 | Columbia University (CU) | 463 (5) | 72 (16) | 138 (30) | 93 (20) | 147 (32) | 14 (3) |
| 10 | University of California LA (UCLA) | 255 (3) | 32 (13) | 80 (31) | 50 (20) | 90 (35) | 3 (1) |
| 11 | University of North Carolina (UNC-CH) | 838 (10) | 86 (10) | 323 (39) | 116 (14) | 299 (36) | 14 (2) |
| 12 | University of Cambridge (UC) | 266 (3) | 24 (9) | 64 (24) | 42 (16) | 126 (47) | 10 (4) |
| 13 | University of Toronto (UoT) | 976 (11) | 159 (16) | 340 (35) | 165 (17) | 293 (30) | 19 (2) |
| 13 | Yale University (YU) | 286 (3) | 45 (16) | 72 (25) | 74 (26) | 93 (33) | 2 (1) |
| 15 | University of California Berkeley (UCB) | 190 (2) | 30 (16) | 61 (32) | 21 (11) | 76 (40) | 2 (1) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| | Total | 8801 (100) | 1164 (13) | 2741(31) | 1576 (18) | 3149 (36) | 177 (2) |
|--|--------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|

117

118 [Figure 1]

119 Analysing data from individual universities was a critical component of our analysis which revealed that although
120 some institutions are better than others in terms of representation of NEM women in senior positions, all are doing
121 poorly with respect to EM women. In terms of similarities, there was a drop in the proportion of EM women and
122 an increase in the proportion of NEM men between the mid and senior level in all universities (figure 2). For EM
123 men there was variation between universities, with the proportion of this group gradually increasing from junior
124 to senior levels in six universities but decreasing in eight universities. The proportion of NEM women decreased
125 from mid to senior level positions in the majority of universities (n=11); UCL, UC and YU were exceptions in
126 that the decline was pronounced in EM women whilst static in NEM women.

127 [Figure 2]

128

129 **Numerous legislations, policies and strategies to promote diversity but with limited reporting of outcomes**

130 Legislative protection from employment discrimination on the basis of gender and ethnicity is offered throughout
131 the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States (Appendix 3). For example, the US Executive Order 11246
132 requires federal contractors, such as universities, to take “affirmative action” to prevent discrimination on the
133 basis of ethnicity, religion, gender or national origin”.⁴⁸

134 **Table 2: Policies, action plans and schemes to support diversity at the 15 highest rank public health**
135 **universities**

136

| US News Rank | University | Equal pay policy/pay disclosure | Action plan for equality and diversity | Leadership schemes | Mentoring schemes |
|--------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | Harvard | | Dean’s Annual Report on Diversity and Inclusion: February 2015 | Executive Education – Women’s Leadership Forum | Office of Diversity and Inclusion organizes mentoring programmes |
| 2 | John Hopkins | | Faculty Diversity and Inclusion plan | Leadership plan for Women Faculty | Mentoring and Faculty development for under-represented minorities |
| 3 | Stanford | | Taskforce on Women in Leadership | Diversity Cabinet | Staff Mentorship Program |
| 4 | Oxford | - Equal pay audit -Mandatory Gender Pay Gap reporting | - Strategic plan 2013-18 - Equality objectives 2016-2020 | Oxford Business Network for Women’s Leadership | - Pivot: mentoring program - Springboard Ad Feminam |
| 5 | Uni College London | Market pay policy | - Population Health Faculty Action Plan - Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Strategy 2015-2020 | Leadership and Management Development/Training | uMentor-Online Mentoring Program |
| 6 | London School of Hygiene & Trop Medicine | Equal pay policy | E & D Strategy Action plan: 2016-2019 | - Aurora Women’s Leadership Programme - Future Female Leaders | School’s mentoring scheme |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|---|
| 7 | Uni Michigan Ann Arbor | Freedom of Information Act: Annual Salary Disclosure Report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan 2.0 2017-18 - Toolkit for recruiting diverse staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADVANCE Program: The Leadership Development Workshop - Academic Leadership Programs - Administrative Fellowship Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ADVANCE Program: The Mentor-for-Leadership Lunch Program - Women of Color Task Force |
| 8 | Uni of Washington | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic plan for diversity: five year plan for diversity, equity and inclusion - UW Diversity Blueprint 2017-2021 | UW ADVANCE's Leadership Development Workshops | The Mentoring-for-Leadership Lunch Program for women faculty in ADVANCE departments |
| 9 | Columbia | | Taskforce on Diversity, Culture, and Inclusion | Leadership and Management Programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mentoring Training series - Sponsorship opportunities for women and minority faculty to attend development seminars |
| 10 | University of California, LA | | Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) | | Mentoring, career advising, and professional development for faculty |
| 11 | University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equal Employment Opportunity Plan - North Carolina Health Careers Access Program | Carolina Women's Leadership Council | As part of Carolina Women's Leadership Council: Mentoring future generations of women philanthropists at Carolina |
| 12 | Cambridge | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equal Pay Reviews - Equality Assurance Assessments - InterConnect Steering Group | Women in Science, Engineering and Technology Initiative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Senior Academic Promotions CV Scheme - Springboard: A women's development programme |
| 13t | University of Toronto | | University Of Toronto's CRC Equity, Diversity And Inclusion Action Plan Targets 2017-2019 | New and Evolving Academic Leaders (NEAL) Programs | Career Development Mentoring Workshops |
| 13y | Yale | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Affirmative Action plan (updated annually) - YSPH Diversity Committee - Initiative for Faculty Excellence and Diversity - Presidential Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion - The Women Faculty Forum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ELAM- Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine Program for Women - Emerging Women's Leadership program (EWLP) - Diversity Leadership Council - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School of Medicine, Office for women in Medicine - Minority Organization for Retention and Expansion (MORE) in School of Medicine - Working Women's Network (WWN) |

| | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| 15 | University of California, Berkeley | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equal pay act - UC Berkeley Faculty Salary Equity Study, Annual update | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pathways to Excellence: Campus Strategic Plan for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity - Plan of action for diversity | Cal Women's Network | Cal Women's Network |
|----|------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|

In line with the legislation, all universities reported having some policies and accompanying procedures in place to ensure a safe and non-discriminatory employment environment (Table 2). In the UK, several universities have signed up to voluntary schemes such as to the Race Equality Charter and the Athena SWAN award. The Athena SWAN is the first Charter that has been linked to funded research activities in applications made to the UK National Institute for Health Research. However, although action plans operating at the macro (institutional) level, meso (departmental) level or micro-(interpersonal) level have been developed as means to operationalise their diversity strategies, these are rarely linked to specific goals or reported outcomes, such as the proportion of women in senior and leadership positions. Similarly on Equal Pay Policies, only a few universities, such as LSHTM and UCL, reported having documents specifically describing procedures. Other universities, such as the UM-AA, produce a detailed Salary Disclosure Report but have not introduced a specific Equal Pay Policy.

Instead of focusing on tangible goals, most strategies focus on raising awareness both of issues surrounding gender and equality, as well as awareness of the policies in place to address these issues. For example, increasing knowledge is central to the LSHTM equality and diversity strategic plan. Similarly, the UO Strategic Plan 2013 – 2018 includes awareness as key to their strategy. Institutions also claim that they seek to embed diversity and equality within the institutional culture to create a climate supportive of gender and equality policies, which is another strategy whose success is difficult to assess. Beyond the creation of cultures and climate, all institutions also reported the need to develop recruiting practices that are equitable and support the retention and professional development of diverse faculty and staff. Activities to support these goals include organisational management activities (for example, the creation of frameworks and standards by UW), collaborative activities (for example, the use of committees, advisory boards and meetings by UCLA), implementation activities (for example, the UNC-CH's goal-oriented training for supervisors) and monitoring or evaluation activities. We found that monitoring and evaluation activities were poorly reported and those that were presented, lacked detail and tended to focus on process indicators rather than outcomes.

Institutions reported a range of additional activities and initiatives related to gender and equality. These include, programmes, fellowships and schemes; surveys and assessments; media and communications materials; and outreach activities such as lecture series. Reported programmes to support equality and diversity include those specific to gender issues, such initiatives as the UC Springboard Programme, which is a personal development programme for all female staff/graduate students. Others focus on increasing numbers of faculty from disadvantaged backgrounds entering academia, such as the UNC-CH Health careers Access Program which provides opportunities for training, awareness activities and cultivating interest in underrepresented groups. Others, such as UC, focus on retention and promotion of existing women academics.

Most universities reported having support groups and mentorship programmes targeting women, such as the UO Gender Equality Steering Group (GESG). Fewer universities described having associations to target ethnic disparity issues, and the ones that did tended to be US based.

Strengths, limitations and implications of our study

Our study indicates that gender and ethnicity intersect to produce a magnified disadvantage for EM women academics working in the top 15 public health universities, despite policies and strategies to facilitate staff diversity. Literature on this topic links the underrepresentation of women and EM groups in more senior academic positions to: worse working conditions (temporary contracts, lower pay for the same job);²³ lower chances of recruitment or promotion;²⁴⁻²⁸ lower success rates in funding applications;^{29,30} research publications perceived to be less important;³¹⁻³⁴ and less respect from students.^{3,5} Since this study focused on the top 15 universities as ranked by US News, our sample only included universities in three countries, and a similar analysis of universities from other countries may yield different results.

We acknowledge that other factors not analysed in this study, such as socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are also important in shaping experiences of barriers to career progression, as are policies that

may not be labelled as ‘diversity’ efforts.⁵⁴ However, these factors are often poorly documented, and classifications based on individuals’ name are not possible. Further study into the multiple forms of discrimination experienced by academic public health staff is therefore critical. Our cross-sectional analysis presents a snapshot of the staff ethnic and gender diversity at present, and a study that tracks individuals’ as they progress through the career ladder may also be very valuable.

Finally, while the inclusion of diversity data into ranking systems offers a promising step forward in elucidating and addressing gender and ethnic-based inequalities in public health universities, this can be done alongside other activities that seek to achieve greater diversity in academia. Some of these strategies could include: the use of gender and ethnicity - blind review in hiring, award nomination, funding decisions, and publication processes; mentorship of junior staff by senior staff from less advantaged groups (for example, EM women); targeted leadership training scholarships; research-enabling grants; diversity pay reporting requirements; and increased funding for pilot projects of different mitigation strategies that could improve equity in the workplace^{19,23,56-59}. Ultimately, strategies or actions taken to promote diversity are only useful if they have a measurable impact, and impact can only be assessed through regular and transparent monitoring of gender and ethnicity along the academic seniority pathway.

References

1. Cornford FM. *Microcosmographia academica: Being a guide for the young academic politician*. Fifth ed. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes; 1908.
2. Hausmann R. The global gender gap report 2009: World Economic Forum, 2009.
3. Valian V. Beyond gender schemas: Improving the advancement of women in academia. *Hypatia* 2005; **20**(3): 198-213.
4. UNFPA. *Worlds apart: reproductive health and rights in an age of inequality.*: United Nations Population Fund, 2017.
5. Advisory CaASA. Gender pay gap reporting, 2017.
6. Palmer K. Gender pay gap: More than 500 firms reveal their figures. BBC News. 2018.
7. Implicit bias in academia: A challenge to the meritocratic principle and to women’s careers – And what to do about it. *LERU* 2018; **advice paper no. 23**.
8. Talib Z, Barry M. Women leaders in global health. *The Lancet Global Health* 2017; **5**(6): e565-e6.

9. Ward ME. Gender and promotion in the academic profession. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 2001; **48**(3): 283-302.
10. Lancet T. Year of reckoning for women in science. *The Lancet*; **391**(10120): 513.
11. Wright AL, Schwindt LA, Bassford TL, et al. Gender differences in academic advancement: patterns, causes, and potential solutions in one US College of Medicine. *Academic Medicine* 2003; **78**(5): 500-8.
12. Monroe K, Ozyurt S, Wrigley T, Alexander A. Gender equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on politics* 2008; **6**(2): 215-33.
13. Knights D, Richards W. Sex discrimination in UK academia. *Gender, Work & Organization* 2003; **10**(2): 213-38.
14. Savigny H. Women, know your limits: Cultural sexism in academia. *Gender and Education* 2014; **26**(7): 794-809.
15. How implicit bias can undermine academic meritocracy. *Euro Scientist* 2018.
16. Menges RJ, Exum WH. Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education* 1983; **54**(2): 123-44.
17. Turner CSV. Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *The Journal of Higher Education* 2002; **73**(1): 74-93.
18. Kameny RR, DeRosier ME, Taylor LC, McMillen JS, Knowles MM, Pifer K. Barriers to career success for minority researchers in the behavioral sciences. *Journal of Career Development* 2014; **41**(1): 43-61.
19. Allen-Ramdial S-AA, Campbell AG. Reimagining the Pipeline: Advancing STEM Diversity, Persistence, and Success. *BioScience* 2014; **64**(7): 612-8.
20. Weinberg SL. Monitoring faculty diversity: The need for a more granular approach. *The Journal of Higher Education* 2008; **79**(4): 365-87.
21. Etzkowitz H, Ranga M. Gender dynamics in science and technology: From the “leaky pipeline” to the “vanish box”. *Brussels Economic Review* 2011; **54**(2/3): 131-48.
22. Tesch BJ, Wood HM, Helwig AL, Nattinger AB. Promotion of women physicians in academic medicine: glass ceiling or sticky floor? *Jama* 1995; **273**(13): 1022-5.
23. Union UaC. The gender pay gap in higher education: 2015/16 data report, 2017.
24. Moss-Racusin CA, Dovidio JF, Brescoll VL, Graham MJ, Handelsman J. Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2012; **109**(41): 16474-9.
25. Jayakumar UM, Howard TC, Allen WR, Han JC. Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education* 2009; **80**(5): 538-63.
26. Price EG, Gozu A, Kern DE, et al. The role of cultural diversity climate in recruitment, promotion, and retention of faculty in academic medicine. *Journal of general internal medicine* 2005; **20**(7): 565-71.
27. Stolt P. Gender Differences Within Academia: A case study on the probability of promotion. *Linnaeus University, School of Business and Economics* 2012.
28. De Paola M, Scoppa V. Gender discrimination and evaluators’ gender: evidence from Italian academia. *Economica* 2015; **82**(325): 162-88.
29. Shavers VL, Fagan P, Lawrence D, et al. Barriers to racial/ethnic minority application and competition for NIH research funding. *Journal of the National Medical Association* 2005; **97**(8): 1063.
30. Gender Statistics. *The European Research Council* 2016.
31. Harris M, Marti J, Watt H, Bhatti Y, Macinko J, Darzi AW. Explicit bias toward high-income-country research: a randomized, blinded, crossover experiment of English clinicians. *Health Affairs* 2017; **36**(11): 1997-2004.
32. Harris M, Macinko J, Jimenez G, Mullachery P. Measuring the bias against low-income country research: an Implicit Association Test. *Globalization and health* 2017; **13**(1): 80.

33. Gender in the Global Research Landscape. *Elsevier* 2017.

34. Larivière V, Ni C, Gingras Y, Cronin B, Sugimoto CR. Bibliometrics: Global gender disparities in science. *Nature News* 2013; **504**(7479): 211.

35. Pittman CT. Race and gender oppression in the classroom: The experiences of women faculty of color with white male students. *Teaching Sociology* 2010; **38**(3): 183-96.

36. World University Rankings 2018. 2018. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings>.

37. Report UNaW. Best Global Universities Rankings. 2018. <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-global-universities/rankings>.

38. Morse R, Krivian A. Best Global Universities for Social Sciences and Public Health. 2018. <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-global-universities/social-sciences-public-health> (accessed 1st Feb 2018).

39. Universities ARoW. ShanghaiRanking's Global Ranking of Academic Subjects 2017 - Public Health. 2017. <http://www.shanghairanking.com/Shanghairanking-Subject-Rankings/public-health.html> (accessed 01/03/2018).

40. Wikipedia. List of academic ranks. 2018. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_academic_ranks (accessed 10th Feb 2018).

41. Boston_University_Council. Classification of ranks and titles. 2007. <https://www.bu.edu/handbook/appointments-and-promotions/classification-of-ranks-and-titles/> (accessed 15th Feb 2018).

42. Sutton C. Academic ranks in the US and UK. 2013 (accessed 15th Feb 2018).

43. Academic_Careers_Observatory. USA, Academic career structure. 21st Dec 2016 (accessed 20th Feb 2018).

44. Eckel P, King J. An Overview of Higher Education in the United States. Washington, DC American Council of Education; 2003.

45. Gaff J, Pruitt-Logan A, Sims L, Denecke D, Program_participants. Preparing Future Faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools; 2003.

46. Charmaz K. Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative research. *Sage Publications Ltd, London* 2006.

47. Strauss AL. Qualitative analysis for social scientists: Cambridge University Press; 1987.

48. Equal Employment Opportunity. Executive Order No 11246. United States; 1965.

49. Boulton G. University rankings: Diversity, excellence and the European initiative. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2011; **13**: 74-82.

50. Unit EC. Athena SWAN Charter, 2018.

51. Vernos I. Research management: Quotas are questionable. *Nature* 2013; **495**(7439): 39.

52. Luc Soete SS, Deniz Eröcal, Baskaran Angathevar and Rajah Rasiah. UNESCO Science Report: towards 2030 – Executive Summary, 2015.

53. Clark J, Zuccala E, Horton R. Women in science, medicine, and global health: call for papers. *The Lancet* 2017; **390**(10111): 2423-4.

54. Dipboye RL, Colella A. Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases: Psychology Press; 2013.

55. Espeland W, Sauder M. Rankings and Diversity. *Review of Law and Social Justice* 2009; **18**(3): 587-608.

56. Downs JA, Reif LK, Hokororo A, Fitzgerald DW. Increasing Women in Leadership in Global Health. *Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges* 2014; **89**(8): 1103-7.

57. Javadi D, Vega J, Etienne C, Wandira S, Doyle Y, Nishtar S. Women Who Lead: Successes and Challenges of Five Health Leaders. *Health Systems & Reform* 2016; **2**(3): 229-40.

58. Morgan R, Dhatt R, Muraya K, Buse K, George AS. Recognition matters: only one in ten awards given to women. *The Lancet* 2017; **389**(10088): 2469.

59. Raymond J. Most of us are biased. *Nature* 2013; **495**: 33.

